



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/051,951	01/17/2002	John R. Hind	RSW920010122US1	1746	
7590	03/07/2006		EXAMINER		
Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts IBM Corporation T81/503 PO Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709		BETIT, JACOB F			
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
		2164			

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/051,951	HIND ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jacob F. Betit	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05-January-2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23,25-50,52-78,80-84 and 88-93 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 25,52,80 and 88-90 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23,26-50,53-78,81-84 and 91-93 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2164

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. In response to communications filed on 5-January-2006 claims 1, 28, 55 have been amended, and claims 91-93 have been added. Claims 1-23, 25-50, 52-78, 80-84, and 88-93 are presently pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83, and 91-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1).

As to claim 1, Dedrick teaches a method of managing meta data using a central repository at a central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by a computing device through a communications network (see abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

connecting to the central repository through the communications network based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

Art Unit: 2164

updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29); and

utilizing, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22),

wherein the utilizing step comprises retrieving, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

Dedrick does not teach meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, based on at least a current role of the user.

Arlein et al. teaches this (see paragraph 0009 and see paragraph 0032). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Arlein et al. because the teachings would customize the content of the user based on the user's activities while preserving privacy of the users (see Arlein et al., paragraph 0009).

As to claims 2, 29, and 56, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of:  
uploading any new segment from the computing device to the central repository at a predetermined time (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claims 3, 30, and 57, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of:

Art Unit: 2164

incrementally uploading any new meta data generated during the current user session from the computing device to the central repository (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claims 4, 31, and 59, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the connecting step comprises:

receiving, by the central repository subsystem, authentication information from the user (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 10-15);

verifying validity of the authentication information (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 14-17); and

notifying the computing device that the user has proper authority to access the central repository if the authentication information is verified as valid (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 20-24).

As to claims 10 and 37, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the retrieving step is performed using heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12); and the utilizing step further comprises applying the retrieved meta data in each of the different contexts (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claims 11 and 38, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context comprises at least one of the following: opening a web page, filling in a computer form, filling in a password-changing form, providing a certificate, opening a computer file, processing a

Art Unit: 2164

computer file, or executing an application program (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 23).

As to claims 1.7 and 44, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a computer form, and the applying step comprises: automatically filling in the computer form with said most appropriate meta data (see Dedrick, column 8, lines 13-22).

As to claims 20 and 47, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the utilizing step comprises:

formulating search requirements based on a current context of using the computing device; and executing a search based on the search requirements using the heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 21 and 48, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the search requirements specify weighted properties of the current context of using the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 22 and 49, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of: providing a graphical user interface (GUI) for allowing the user to organize the meta data collection (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 53-64 and see column 8, lines 23-31).

As to claim 28, Dedrick as modified, teaches a computer program product embodied on computer readable medium readable by at least one of a computing device and a central repository subsystem, for managing meta data using a central repository at the central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by the computing device through a communication network (see abstract), the computer program product comprising:

computer executable code configured to connect, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

computer executable code configured to update a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29); and

computer executable code configured to utilize, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22),

wherein the computer executable code configured to utilize comprises computer executable code configured to retrieve, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different context of using the computer device, (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

Dedrick does not teach meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different context of using the computer device, based on at least a current role of the user.

Arlein et al. teaches this (see paragraph 0009 and see paragraph 0032). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Arlein et al. because the teachings would customize the content of the user based on the user's activities while preserving privacy of the users (see Arlein et al., paragraph 0009).

As to claim 55, Dedrick teaches a system for managing meta data in a secure manner (see abstract), the system comprising:

a central repository subsystem comprising a central repository for storing a plurality of segments associated with a user in a collection order (see column 9, lines 57-65); and

at least one computing device capable of communicating with the central repository subsystem through a communications network, the computing device comprising a local repository and being capable of connecting, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21), updating the local repository with at least one of the segments from the central repository to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29), and utilizing the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22),

wherein the computer device retrieves, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of the different context of using the computer device, (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

Dedrick does not teach meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different context of using the computer device, based on at least a current role of the user.

Arlein et al. teaches this (see paragraph 0009 and see paragraph 0032). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Arlein et al. because the teachings would customize the content of the user based on the user's activities while preserving privacy of the users (see Arlein et al., paragraph 0009).

As to claim 77, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising: a meta data editor for allowing the user to organize the meta data collection. (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 53-64 and see column 8, lines 23-31).

As to claim 83, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the central repository and the local repository is implemented using a network-attached storage (see Dedrick, column 3, lines 7-49).

As to claims 91-93, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data collection stored in the local repository of the computer device at the user's side (see Dedrick, figure 2, reference number 27) includes a plurality of meta data groups, each of the meta data groups corresponding to one of a plurality of roles of the user (see Arlein et al., paragraph 0032).

Art Unit: 2164

4. Claims 5-6, 32-33, and 60-61 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83 and 91-93 above, and in further view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 5,638,448).

As to claims 5, 32, and 60, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the authentication information comprises user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem.

Nguyen teaches secure communication sessions on a network (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the authentication information comprises user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem (see column 16, lines 13-33).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Nguyen because the teachings would prevent the password from being transferred over the network and allow both the client and server to authenticate each other (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-16).

As to claims 6, 33, and 61, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the verifying step comprises: determining a secret key represented as a hash of: the received user identification concatenated with a hash of the received identifier, concatenated with the received pass phrase; and comparing the secret key with a stored key associated with the user (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-33).

5. Claims 7-9 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83 and 91-93 above, and in further view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claims 7 and 34, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the updating step comprises:

- determining if the local repository is at a null state;
- first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository is not at a null state; and
- second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state.

Kim teaches using a mobile profile to dynamically access programs, URLs, telephone numbers, television channels, and radio stations (see abstract) in which he teaches wherein the updating step comprises: determining if the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 38-65); first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository is not at a null state (see column 7, lines 52-65); and second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 44-51).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Kim because the teachings would synchronize data with the server if the profile was already on the client and copy the profile to the client if it was not already there (see Kim, column 7, lines 38-65).

As to claims 8 and 35, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further comprises:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said first requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65);  
decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer); and  
applying the decrypted at least one segment to the meta data collection to produce the meta data collection associated with the user (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65).

As to claims 9 and 36, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further comprises:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said second requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51);  
decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer); and

generating the meta data collection for the user using the decrypted at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 23-25).

6. Claims 12-16, and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83, and 91-93 above, and in further view of Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287).

As to claims 12 and 39, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the utilizing step further comprises:

continuously collecting meta data resulting from use of the computing device during the current user session at the computing device (see column 7, lines 40-52).

Dedrick as modified, still does not teach the method further comprises:

generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and

processing the new segment.

Bull et al. teaches aggregation and synthesization of information (see abstract), in which he teaches the method further comprises: generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and processing the new segment (see column 4, lines 28-32).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Bull et al.

Art Unit: 2164

because the teachings would allow updated information to be available the next time they use the system (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claims 13 and 40, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the processing step includes:

updating the meta data collection with the new segment (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claims 14 and 41, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data comprises application data for being usable in an application executable on the computing device, and context data for identifying context in which said application data are used (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and wherein the utilizing step further comprises:

determining statistical information associated with the meta data, the statistical information indicating relationships between the meta data, wherein the retrieving step is performed in part based on the statistical information (see Dedrick, column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12).

As to claims 15 and 42, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the context data identify at least one of the following: user roles, uniform resource identifiers (URIs), file names, and/or form names pertaining to the application data (see Dedrick, column 5, lines 1-16).

As to claims 16 and 43, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the application data comprise at least one of the following: page display setting data, file display setting data, user ID/password combinations, field values for computer forms, user's preference data, bookmarks, and certificates (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

7. Claims 18 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83 and 91-93 above; and in further view of Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230 B1).

As to claims 18 and 45, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further comprises:

retrieving, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and  
presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

Mohan et al. teaches a client-server independent intermediary system (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further includes: retrieving, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration (see column 11, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Mohan et

Art Unit: 2164

al. because the teachings would allow the user to choose to leave some items blank or fill in items that are not in the normally found in the user's profile without having to delete or fill in the items every time a particular form is filled out (see Mohan et al., column 11, lines 2-6).

8. Claims 19 and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83 and 91-93 above, and in further view of Chun et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0184527 A1).

As to claims 19 and 46, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data comprises a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step comprises:

presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format;  
determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and  
presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

Chun et al. teaches an intelligent data securing apparatus (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data comprises a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step comprises: presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format; determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and presenting the actual password

in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password (see page 5, paragraph 0050).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Chun et al. because the teachings would give the user the ability to change passwords and retrieve forgotten passwords (see Chun et al., page 5, paragraph 0050).

9. Claims 23, 50, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83 and 91-93 above, and in further view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,636,246 B1).

As to claims 23 and 50, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

Nagahara et al. teaches wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection (see column 5, lines 18-33).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Nagahara et al. because the teachings would provide superior operability when making selections from a menu (see Nagahara et al., abstract).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 78, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the meta data editor displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

Nagahara et al. teaches wherein the meta data editor displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection (see column 5, lines 18-33).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Nagahara et al. because the teachings would provide superior operability when making selections from a menu (see Nagahara et al., abstract).

10. Claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83 and 91-93 above, and in further view of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further”.

As to claims 26 and 53, Dedrick as modified, above does not teach wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed by a CDSA add-on module.

“Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” teaches wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed by a CDSA add-on module (see page 1, paragraphs 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” because the teachings would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented into multiple applications (see “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further”, page 1, paragraph 1).

As to claim 58, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the computing device further comprises:

a plurality of applications selectively executable on the computing device (see column 5, lines 52-67);

a data repository module, provided as an add-in module to the security-service providing architecture, for utilizing the meta data collection to assist the user in using the computing device (see Figure 8, step 306); and

an encryption/decryption module for encryption any new segment to be transmitted to the central repository subsystem (see column 6, line 35 through column 7, line 8).

Dedrick as modified, still does not teach a security-service providing architecture structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications.

“Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” teaches a security-service providing architecture

structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications (see page 1, paragraphs 3-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” because the teachings would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented into multiple applications (see “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further”, page 1, paragraph 1).

As to claim 65, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module retrieves the most appropriate meta data using heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and transmits the retrieved meta data to an appropriate one of the applications which in turn applies the retrieved meta data in each of the different contexts (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claim 66, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context comprises at least one of the following: opening a web page, filling in a computer form, filling in a password-changing form, providing a certificate, opening a computer file, processing a computer file, or executing an application program (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40 through column 8, line 23).

As to claim 72, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a computer form, and said appropriate one of the applications automatically fills the computer form with said most appropriate meta data (see Dedrick, column 8, lines 13-22).

As to claim 75, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module formulates search requirements based on a current context of using the computing device, and executes a search based on the search requirements using heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claim 76, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the search requirements specify weighted properties of the current context of using the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9, through column 8, line 31).

As to claim 81, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the computing device is configured in Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the data repository module is an add-on module to the CDSA configuration (see “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” page 1, paragraphs 1-2).

11. Claims 27, 54, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, 83, and 91-93 above, and in further view of Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0077842 A1).

As to claims 27, 54, and 82, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols.

Charisius et al. teaches wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols (see page 1, paragraph 0010).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Charisius et al. because these teachings would allow multiple users to view the same workflow and project plans, provide persistent storage, monitor the progress of an activated project plan, and simultaneously create plans from the same workflow (see Charisius et al., page 1, paragraph 0010).

12. Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1), in further view of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and in further view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claim 62, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the data repository module determines if the local repository is at a null state, transmits a first request to the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the local repository is not at a null state, and transmits a second

Art Unit: 2164

request to the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the local repository is at a null state.

Kim teaches wherein the data repository module determines if the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 38-65), transmits a first request to the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the local repository is not at a null state (see column 7, lines 52-65), and transmits a second request to the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 44-51).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Kim because the teachings would synchronize data with the server if the profile was already on the client and copy the profile to the client if it was not already there (see Kim, column 7, lines 38-65).

As to claim 63, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the encryption/decryption module receives at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said first request (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65), and decrypts the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer), and wherein the data repository module applies the decrypted at least one segment to the meta data collection to produce the meta data collection associated with the user (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 64, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the encryption/decryption module receives at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said second request (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51), and decrypts the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer), and wherein the data repository module generates the meta data collection for the user using the decrypted at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 23-25).

13. Claims 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1), in further view of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and in further view of Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287).

As to claim 67, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module continuously collects meta data resulting from use of the computing device during the current user session at the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

Dedrick as modified, still does not teach generates a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session.

Bull et al. teaches generates a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session (see column 4, lines 28-32).

Art Unit: 2164

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Bull et al. because the teachings would allow updated information to be available the next time they use the system (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claim 68, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module updates the meta data collection with the new segment (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claim 69, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data comprises application data for being usable in an application executable on the computing device, and context data for identifying context in which said application data are used (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and wherein the data repository module determines statistical information associated with the meta data and retrieves said appropriate meta data based on the statistical information, the statistical information indicating relationships between the meta data (see Dedrick, column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12).

As to claim 70, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the context data identify at least one of the following: user roles, uniform resource identifiers (URIs), file names, and/or form names pertaining to the application data (see Dedrick, column 5, lines 1-16).

As to claim 71, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the application data comprises at least one of the following: page display setting data, file display setting data, user ID/password

combinations, field values for computer forms, user's preference data, bookmarks, and certificates (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

14. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1), in further view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and further in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230 B1).

As to claim 73, Dedrick as modified, does not teach wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the data repository module retrieves, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form, and transmits the alternative meta data to said appropriate one of the applications which in turn presents the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

Mohan et al. teaches wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the data repository module retrieves, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form, and transmits the alternative meta data to said appropriate one of the applications which in turn presents the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration (see column 11, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Mohan et al. because the teachings would allow the user to choose to leave some items blank or fill in

items that are not in the normally found in the user's profile without having to delete or fill in the items every time a particular form is filled out (see Mohan et al., column 11, lines 2-6).

15. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1), in further view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and in further view of Chun et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0184527 A1).

As to claim 74, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the data repository module controls said appropriate one of the applications to present to the user the password in an obfuscated format, determines whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user, and controls said appropriate one of the applications to present the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

Chun et al. teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data comprises a user identification and a password, and wherein the data repository module controls said appropriate one of the applications to present to the user the password in an obfuscated format, determines whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user, and controls said appropriate one of the applications to present the actual

Art Unit: 2164

password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password (see page 5, paragraph 0050).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Chun et al. because the teachings would give the user the ability to change passwords and retrieve forgotten passwords (see Chun et al., page 5, paragraph 0050).

16. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1), in further view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and further in view of Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,843 B1).

As to claim 84, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means.

Lim teaches integrating authentication and authorization mechanisms into an application access control system (see abstract) in which he teaches wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means (see column 8, lines 46-58).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified above, by the teachings of Lim

because the teachings would access to remote servers through a common API (see Lim, column 7, lines 34-44).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

17. Claims 25, 52, 80, and 88-90 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments filed 5-January-2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "the Examiner did not clarify how to modify Derick in view of Arlein's teachings on paragraphs 0009 and 0032", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The examiner is not required to give detailed instructions on how to modify a reference to combine it with another. According to MPEP 706.02(j):

After indicating that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner should set forth in the Office action:

- (A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate,
- (B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s),
- (C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and
- (D) an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification.

The examiner has performed these required steps in the previous office action and above.

Applicant sites In re Dembiczak and In re Oetiker as giving a basis for why the examiner is

Art Unit: 2164

required to clarify how to modify the references. In sighting these two cases applicant does not directly quote any sections of these two cases to support the argument. When looking at these cases the examiner did not find any text that supports the argument. In re Dembiczak states that the examiner must provide suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine references, as the examiner did in the previous office action and above. In re Oetiker states that the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting prima facie case of unpatentability, as was done in the rejection.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "Derick and Arlein are non-combinable", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The applicant appears to feel that the references are non-combinable because "Derick and Arlein are different regarding the devices ... [used] to store the user/persona profile". The examiner contends that Arlein is used in modifying Derick to include different (additional) meta data so that the meta data in the profile includes different contexts of using the computer device based on the current role of the user. In modifying Derick to include these different contexts, the place that the profile is stored does not need to be changed. Derick was modified to include one aspect of Arlein not Arlein's entire invention, and it is a reasonable expectation that the "multiple personae" found in Arlein could be adapted to exist locally on the client instead of on a remote server since both have storage space, and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made this modification because it would enable one person to have different profiles based on the actions they are currently trying to perform such as work entertainment medical shopping investment ect. (see Arlein et al., paragraph 0032).

In response to the applicant's arguments directed towards newly cited claims 91-93, the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The applicant appears to be confused as to the exact feature that Dedrick is being modified to include. Dedrick is deemed to teach all of the limitations of claim one except one. Dedrick does not teach the profiles having different meta data for different contexts based on a current role of the user. This is the only feature that Arlein is relied upon to teach. Other features of Arlein do not need to be included when this modification takes place. Arlein clearly teaches this one feature in paragraph 0032. "A persona represents a role in which the user engages in web activity. Examples of personae may be, but not limited to, 'work,' 'entertainment,' 'medical,' 'shopping,' 'investing,' ect." "[I]f a user visits two different sites under a 'work' persona, then information about the user's activities undertaken at each site are available to the other site, provided that both sites allow this. However, if the user visits a site under a 'work persona, then the user need not fear that his or her 'entertainment' actives will become known to that site" (i.e. different meta data for different persona).

### *Conclusion*

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2164

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

jfb

23 Feb 2006



SAM RIMELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER